

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT			1. CONTRACT ID CODE		PAGE OF PAGES 1 28				
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. A0001		3. EFFECTIVE DATE 08/06/2002		4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.		5. PROJECT NO. (If applicable)			
6. ISSUED BY U.S. DOT/RSPA/Volpe Center 55 Broadway Cambridge MA 02142		CODE DTS-852		7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 6) U.S. DOT/RSPA/Volpe Center 55 Broadway Cambridge MA 02142		CODE DTS-852			
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., street, country, State and ZIP Code)				(X)			9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO.		
				X			DTRS57-02-R-20021		
							9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 08/01/2002		
							10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.		
							10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)		
CODE		FACILITY CODE							
11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATIONS									
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and the date specified for receipt of Offers <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> is extended, <input type="checkbox"/> is not extended. Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods: (a) By completing items 8 and 15, and returning <u>3</u> copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment number. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.									
12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)									
13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS, IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.									
(X)		A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.							
		B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103 (b).							
		C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF :							
		D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)							
E. IMPORTANT : Contractor <input type="checkbox"/> is not, <input type="checkbox"/> is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.									
14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.) FOB: Destination Delete Subsection L.7, L.8. and all of Section M and replace with the the attached Subsection L.7, L.8 and Section M. The due date for submission of proposal is here by extended to 2:00 pm October 2, 2002.									
15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)				16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print)					
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR (Signature of the person authorized to sign)		15C. DATE SIGNED		16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY (Signature of the person authorized to sign)		16C. DATE SIGNED			

NSN 7540-01-152-8070
PREVIOUS EDITION UNUSABLE

30-105

STANDARD FORM 30 (REV. 10-83)
Prescribed by GSA
FAR(48 CFR) 53.243

TECHNICAL INFORMATION INSTRUCTION TO OFFERORS

A. General Instructions

The response to this request will consist of two proposals for the Volpe Center evaluation. A Technical Proposal will describe methodologies, management systems and company experience to be applied in accomplishing technical tasks in areas indicated in the Statement of Work. A Cost/Business Management Proposal will describe the cost of the resources to be applied in accomplishing the objectives of the proposed contract.

The Technical Proposal must be specific and complete. The proposal must demonstrate a thorough understanding of the requirements and a logical plan for accomplishing the objectives. It should also include, where applicable, a description of proven techniques or new techniques that are proposed to be utilized, a complete explanation of the method and procedures proposed to be followed, and a detailed description of the offeror's capabilities and experience to be applied in satisfying contractual requirements.

B. The Technical Proposal Content

The Technical Proposal must include the following six sections:

- 1) Staff Support
- 2) Facilities
- 3) Management Program
- 4) Task Item Capabilities
- 5) Hypothetical Tasks
- 6) Past Performance

The requirements for each of these sections are discussed below.

L.7.B.1. Staff Support

This section must include the following:

- Letters of intent from any subcontractors or consultants named in the proposal indicating their intention to perform work under this contract and specifying the staffing level of commitment.
- Names and summaries of qualifications of the offeror's staff, any outside subcontractors, and any consultants that will perform the work.
- A separate identification of the Core Technical Staff (who will form the nucleus for work performed under this solicitation) from the Adjunct Technical Staff that would be available only in a support role for specific tasks.

- Detailed discussion of the qualifications of the Core Technical Staff.
- Detailed discussion of the technical and managerial experience of the offeror's proposed Project Manager, and of his/her counterpart in any subcontractor organization.
- A matrix breakdown, by SOW Task Item, of all available staff (including subcontractors and consultants) who could support each item. The staff shall be individually and organizationally identified, and shall be grouped by appropriate level (e.g., senior engineers, engineers, analysts, etc.).

L.7.B.2.Facilities

This section must include a detailed description of the nature, availability, and contractor experience with the following elements, where appropriate to the Technical Area requirements:

- Computer Systems/Capabilities
- Data Acquisition Systems/Hardware/Instrumentation
- Laboratory/Test Support Facilities

If certain equipment/facility is not available in-house, the respondent must have an agreement with an organization that can provide the necessary elements.

L.7.B.3.Management Program

In proposing a management program, the offeror shall fully describe the system to be used for receiving, planning, administering, and coordinating specific work assignments, and for activating any subcontractors or consultants.

The management program must include a task tracking and cost allocation system that shows the percent of actual to budget expenditure versus the estimated percent of actual completion of each assigned task. This tracking system must also include any subcontracted items of work.

L.7.B.4.Task Item Capabilities

In this section, the offeror shall individually address each of the Task Items identified in the Statement of Work (Section C) under the subsection C.4 - Detailed Items of Work. The following format shall be used:

- The discussion of each Task Item must be completely self-contained, repeating or reorganizing relevant material as required.
- The offeror shall illustrate his capability to support each Task Item by demonstrating his experience and expertise as would apply to each Task Item. In describing relevant experience the offeror should identify the scope of responsibility and the type of work performed.

- The offeror must also identify the proposed staff for each Task Item, and should discuss the relevant qualifications of the staff commensurate with the Task requirements.

L.7.B.5. Hypothetical Tasks

As a demonstration of the contractor's capabilities to meet Volpe's Structures and Mechanics technical support needs, the contractor shall respond to the following hypothetical tasks. The response shall demonstrate the contractor's fundamental understanding of the technical areas and issues of the problem as described without actually performing the task. The response shall be structured according to the following outline (numbers in parentheses indicate maximum number of pages for each section) with text font size not smaller than 10:

1. Description of the task objectives and a statement of the problem. Avoid a simple regurgitation or paraphrasing of the original task statement of work. (1)
2. Discussion of technical issues germane to accomplishing the objective(s). (4)
3. List potential approaches with a discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of each approach and the potential for success and failure of each. (3)
4. Description of the specific approach contractor would recommend for the stated problem, and the rationale for selection of that approach above others. (2)
5. A plan for using contractor's personnel, subcontractors and other resources to accomplish the task. Discuss the specific personnel assignments in line with the specific capabilities versus task elements. (2)
6. Describe what special advantage your particular team brings to this task that would make it advantageous to the government to have your organization perform this task. (2)
7. Provide an engineering cost estimate for completing the project, including draft and final reports and other deliverables. (1)

If the offeror feels that additional information is needed to respond to the hypothetical task, he should make a reasonable assumption as to what the information should be, document the assumption, and proceed with his response as though the assumed information were originally included in the Hypothetical Task Directive. The general reasonableness of such assumptions will make a favorable impression upon the evaluators. All data sources and assumptions should be documented clearly in the response to the initial task directive. The response to the hypothetical task must not exceed the aforementioned 15 pages per Hypothetical Task Directive, including tables, graphs or illustrations.

EXHIBIT A

TECHNICAL SUPPORT IN STRUCTURE AND MECHANICS

**RFP: DTRS57-02-R-20021
HYPOTHETICAL TASK DESCRIPTION**

HYPOTHETICAL TASK Number

- 1 High Speed Rail Standards Application
- 2 In-Situ Rail Force Determination
- 3 Heavy Axle Load (HAL) Influence on Rail Integrity

Hypothetical Task 1: High Speed Rail Standards Application

Background: A high-speed rail consortium is proposing to implement high-speed rail service in a corridor on the Pacific Coast from San Francisco to Los Angeles. The plan is to upgrade existing rail corridors for 200mph operating speeds employing new European train set designs such as the ICE3 or the TGV. The tracks are required to carry both heavy haul freight and high-speed passenger traffic. Approval from the FRA has been sought by the consortium to apply the same track standards applied to Acela and its acceptance. FRA wants to evaluate the acceptability of this proposition in part by determining the vehicle specific loads that the proposed train operation applies to the track in order to guide the acceptability of the proposed rebuild. FRA has asked the Volpe Center to support this effort by developing a test plan responsive to this task and then participating in the tests, data reduction, analysis, and acceptability assessments.

Several choices are available for the potential tests. Special runs may be made on a segment of the Northeast Corridor north of Providence, Rhode Island on nights and weekends. The US DOT's Transportation Technology Center (TTC) in Pueblo, Colorado could be used as was in the original Acela testing. A designated portion of track on the existing Pacific corridor could be upgraded/rebuilt and used for tests. The final test plan could include a combination of all three options or if some other site may prove better, that too could be considered.

Specific Task Statement of Work: The contractor shall provide the necessary and appropriate personnel, services, equipment, facilities and support to complete the following items of work:

1. Develop the rationale and criteria for the proposed tests, the type, number and location of tests, and a clear description of the vehicle and track parameters that need to be determined/monitored, and how the expected results are to be used by the FRA to accept or reject the consortium's request.
2. Develop the experiment design and test plan in accordance with the rationale/criteria above. If there are measurements/parameters which might require new innovative instrumentation/measurement techniques (especially where past results were inadequate and need improvement), suggest what new concepts might be explored to provide the necessary data.
3. Recommend the appropriate vehicle-track interaction analyses, models, and predictive tools to be used in conjunction with the anticipated test data to perform the required evaluation studies. Where models are found to be insufficient for a particular application, recommend the required model development or improvement.
4. Document the results of the above in a technical report to be submitted to Volpe within eight (8) months from TO'S effective date.

Hypothetical Task 2: In-Situ Rail Force Determination

Background: A key element of rail safety depends on the control of thermal and mechanical forces in CWR to prevent catastrophic derailments due to track buckling, track lateral shift, and pull-apart failures. Considerable research has been focused on development of mathematical models to predict these failures, on the quantification of the key influencing parameters, and on preventive measures for problem mitigation. A significant component of problem mitigation is the control of the longitudinal force levels in CWR to within acceptable limits. This can be accomplished by imposing safety requirements on the allowable operational and environmental loads, and monitoring these loads through accepted measurement diagnostics. To date a non-destructive, accurate, and easily deployable longitudinal force measurement system, either vehicle or track borne, is not available, making the development of a CWR force measurement capability a major worldwide research need. For better management of derailment

prevention due to rail fracture and track buckling, the in-situ rail stresses or neutral temperatures must be determined. Over the past several decades, many novel concepts/techniques have been suggested, evaluated and rejected, including concepts based on ultrasonic, acoustics, magneto-elasto-mechanics, Barkhausen-noise, vibro-elastics, x-ray diffraction, optical and mechanical strain sensing, and rail uplift flexure. The key requirements for this measurement to be successful are based on concepts/techniques which:

- Offer a non-destructive measurement capability
- Have the required measurement accuracy
- Can measuring the *absolute rail force*
- Are impervious to rail micro-structure, residual stress, and track/ condition variations, and
- Are easily field or measurement car deployable

With the advent of new advances in the field of sensor technology including nanotechnology and MEMS-based diagnostics, the FRA needs to determine if there is a potential for a non-destructive technique that can be applied to continuous welded rail on both tangent and curved tracks that might be developed over the next five years. It has asked the Volpe Center to make this evaluation.

Specific Task Statement of Work: The contractor shall provide the necessary and appropriate personnel, services, equipment, facilities and support to complete the following items of work:

1. Review technology currently under development in other fields that might be applicable to the rail force measurement problem.
2. Evaluate the prospect/potential of MEMS and nanotechnology based approaches (or others as identified), and select method(s) that might be developed in the next 3-5 years, and indicate what breakthroughs in science would be required to make the techniques workable.
3. Prepare a plan to develop one or more of the most promising methods.
4. Assuming that a *successful measurement technique is available*, develop an approach for the application of the technique for CWR track buckling prevention pull-apart failure mitigation.
5. Document the results of the above in a comprehensive technical report to be submitted to Volpe in an electronic, editable file format six (6) months from TO'S effective date.

Hypothetical Task 3: Heavy Axle Load (HAL) Influence on Rail Integrity

Background:

In order to improve productivity, nominal rail car loads have increased in recent years. The gross rail load of a fully loaded freight car is now 312,000 lb (or 39,000 lb per wheel). These heavier loads (up 19%) are borne by the same track which used to support 263,000-lb vehicles (or 33,000 lb per wheel). Questions arise as to the impact of the increased load on rail equipment and the overall track structure (rail, ties, ballast, etc.).

After reviewing the accident statistics regarding derailments due to broken rails, you find that after a continuous decrease in these derailments since 1978, an upward trend has developed since 1995. You also learn that the majority of the increase on main line track (excluding sidings or yard track) has occurred on track designated as Class 1 and more specifically, on Class 1 track owned by Class I railroads. Class 1 track (the lowest FRA-designated track class excluding excepted track) is the subject of very little federal regulation. As such, the maximum operating speed on Class 1 track is restricted to 10 and 15 mph for

freight and passenger trains, respectively, and track inspections are limited to visual examinations weekly (or twice weekly if passenger trains are operated). Class I railroads represent the largest railroads in the US (in terms of employee hours worked). Class I railroads are distinguished from Class II and III railroads which represent short line or regional operations.

Specific Task Statement of Work:

The contractor shall provide the necessary and appropriate personnel, services, equipment, facilities and support to complete the following items of work:

1. Given that you hypothesize that the increase in nominal axle load on otherwise unimproved track is the cause of the increased number of broken rail derailments, devise a plan to prove the hypothesis.
2. Understanding that internal flaw inspection is not required for Class 1 track under current FRA regulations, develop a realistic inspection requirement to control the increase in derailments due to rail breaks from internal defects and illustrate how your proposal will alleviate the problem.
3. Fracture mechanics models have been developed to estimate internal flaw growth rates due to simulated revenue service. These models have been calibrated using laboratory and field test data which are representative of 33,000-ton nominal axle loads. This data was time-consuming and expensive to obtain. Provide suggestions for alternative method for “tuning” the defect growth model to account for the increased loading without repeating the testing which was conducted for the lower loads.
4. Document the results of the above in a technical report to be submitted to Volpe in an electronic, editable file format four (4) months from TO'S effective date.

L.7.B.6. Past Performance

Offerors shall submit their past performance information as a separate part of their proposal for both the Offeror and major (over 10% of the hours in the cost proposal) proposed subcontractors. Offerors shall submit this past performance data as a separate part of their proposal which is clearly marked and identifiable.

- a. Each Offeror will be evaluated on its performance under existing and prior contracts for similar products or services. Performance information will be used both for responsibility determinations and as an evaluation factor. References other than those provided by the Contractor may be contacted by the Government and the information received will be used in the evaluation of the Offeror's past performance.
- b. The Offeror must provide a list of contracts that it is currently performing or has completed within the past three years. The Offeror must make a good faith effort to insure that the list includes all prime contracts with a value over \$500,000 with the Federal Government. If the Offeror can demonstrate that including information on all prime contracts with the Federal Government over \$500,000 would create an undue burden on the Offeror because of the large number of applicable contracts, then the list may be reduced to reflect contracts that are most relevant and for which data is readily available. The Offeror must describe in its proposal what types of contracts were excluded, and what process was utilized to insure that all prime contracts with the Federal Government over \$500,000 relevant to the Statement of Work were included. However, the list must include all contracts that are clearly relevant such as those applicable contracts reflecting the involvement of the proposed project manager or principal investigators. If performance is evaluated for each Task Order under a contract, the list may be modified accordingly. The

list may also include other contracts considered relevant by the Offeror including those with customers other than the Federal Government. Information regarding the Offeror's performance as a subcontractor with the Federal Government will be obtained from the prime Contractor. Include the following information for each contract:

- 1) Name and address of customer
 - 2) Contract number
 - 3) Contract type
 - 4) Total contract value
 - 5) Description of contract work
 - 6) Contracting Officer address and telephone number
 - 7) Contracting Officer's Technical Representative's address and telephone number
 - 8) Administrative Contracting Officer, if different from item 6, address and telephone number
 - 9) List of major subcontractors
 - 10) Assessment of relevance to requirements identified in this solicitation.
 - 11) Whether any final or interim contract past performance report was or has been issued by the contracting agency. Copies of the final or most current past performance report must be submitted for the five most relevant contracts. Copies of reports on other than the five contracts considered most relevant by the Offeror should not be submitted as part of the proposal, but will be obtained by the Government if the Government considers the contracts relevant.
- c. From the above list, the Offeror must select no more than five contracts that it considers the most relevant in demonstrating its ability to perform the proposed effort. This list of most relevant contracts must be separated from the above list. Offerors may also include information on problems encountered on the five identified contracts and the Offeror's corrective actions.
- d. The Offeror is responsible for making all reasonable efforts to ensure that a completed evaluation report is provided for each of the five cited contracts no later than the due date for receipt of proposals. If the contracting activity has completed a Contractor evaluation report and provided a copy to the Offeror, particularly those completed in accordance with Subpart 42.15 of the FAR, a copy of this report is sufficient. If not, the Offeror is responsible for ensuring that a copy of the performance evaluation report is provided directly to the Volpe Center Contracting Officer by the appropriate customer responding official no later than the proposal submission date. If the customer has not developed its own past performance evaluation report form, VNTSC Form 4200.7, included as Exhibit B to the Technical Proposal Instructions, shall be provided to the customer. Information contained in the evaluation reports shall be considered sensitive and shall not be released to other Offerors. Failure of the Offeror to demonstrate that it has made all reasonable efforts to provide the required past performance reports will result in an unsatisfactory rating for this criteria. The Government reserves the right to obtain additional information from any of the referenced contract contacts and from other Government sources. If the Government receives negative past performance information, (indicating that performance was less than satisfactory) which is not accompanied by a response from the Offeror, a copy of the adverse information will be provided to the Offeror, which will be given a limited period in which to provide a response. If no response is received within the specified time-frame, the negative past performance information will be evaluated as submitted.
- e. Offerors must send a Client Authorization Letter, included as Exhibit C to the Technical Proposal Instructions, to all non-Federal Government references listed in their proposal to assist in the timely processing of past performance evaluations. Client Authorization Letters must be mailed to individual references no later than the proposal submission date. The Offeror shall include a copy of all completed Client Authorization Letters as part of the Past Performance submission.

- f. If the Offeror has no relevant past performance history, it must affirmatively so state. Offerors with no relevant past performance history or Offerors that are unable to provide past performance reports after making all reasonable efforts will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably under this criteria, in accordance with FAR 15.305.
- g. In the case of a relatively new firm (i.e., established within the last 18 months), the Offeror may submit past performance information for contracts on which its corporate management has performed, to supplement any past performance information for the firm itself; this shall be specifically noted in the proposal submission.
- h. If the Offeror does not either include past performance history or affirmatively state that no past performance history exists or can be obtained, the Offeror's proposal will be ineligible for award.
- i. The overall page limit for the list of the five most relevant contracts (including any information on the problems encountered on the contracts) is 15. This page limit does not apply to the list of other less relevant contracts required, or any information submitted by the Offeror to demonstrate that it has made its best efforts to ensure that customers provide past performance reports to the Government.

EXHIBIT B

TECHNICAL SUPPORT IN STRUCTURE AND MECHANICS

RFP: DTRS57-02-R-20021

VNTSC FORM 4200.7

PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM

VOLPE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS CENTER PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION		
CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE REPORT		
<input type="checkbox"/> Final <input type="checkbox"/> Interim – Period Report From: _____ To: _____		
1. Contractor Name and Address: (Identify Division)	2. Contract /Task Number: <u>DTRS57</u>	
	3. Contract Value: \$ _____ (Base Plus Options)	
	4. Contract Award Date: _____	
	5. Contract Completion Date: _____	
6. Type of Contract: (Check all that apply) - <input type="checkbox"/> FP <input type="checkbox"/> FPI <input type="checkbox"/> FP-EPA <input type="checkbox"/> CPFF Completion <input type="checkbox"/> CPFF - Term <input type="checkbox"/> CPIF <input type="checkbox"/> CPAF <input type="checkbox"/> ID/IQ <input type="checkbox"/> BOA <input type="checkbox"/> Requirements <input type="checkbox"/> Labor-Hour <input type="checkbox"/> T&M <input type="checkbox"/> SBSA <input type="checkbox"/> 8(a) <input type="checkbox"/> SBIR <input type="checkbox"/> Sealed Bid <input type="checkbox"/> Negotiated <input type="checkbox"/> Competitive <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Competitive		
7. Description of Requirement:		
8. Initial Ratings: (See Block 15 for Final Rating) Summarize contractor performance and circle in the column on the right of the number which corresponds to the performance rating for each rating category. Attach additional comments as necessary.		
a. Quality of Product/Service	Comments:	0 1 2 3 4
b. Cost Control	Comments:	0 1 2 3 4
c. Timeliness	Comments:	0 1 2 3 4
d. Business Relations	Comments:	0 1 2 3 4
e. Overall Satisfaction Rating	Comments:	0 1 2 3 4
SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION – SEE FAR 3.104		

VNTSC F 4200.7 (5/96)

OPI:85

CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE REPORT INSTRUCTIONS

The Acquisition Division is responsible for the coordination and collection of Contractor Performance Reports. The Contracting Officer (CO) or Administrative Contracting Officer (ACO) will determine whether the report will be completed on a contractor task basis, and will coordinate completion of the attached report form with either the Contracting Officer's Technical Representative (COTR) or Technical Monitor delegated day-to-day responsibility for administration of the identified contractor or task order. This individual should consult with the CO/ACO where necessary to arrive at a consensus on the ratings to be awarded.

Section 42.1503 of the FAR requires that copies of these forms will be provided to the contractor, which must have an opportunity to respond and add comments to agency evaluations as described below. The Acquisition Division will perform this coordination function. Furthermore, the FAR requires that past performance evaluations be marked and treated as Source Selection Information and release of this information is prohibited except to Government personnel and the contractor whose performance is being evaluated. For these reasons, all outside inquiries concerning contractor past performance should be directed to the ACO, who will have access to the completed forms. Also, completed forms should be returned to the attention of the ACO/CO in a sealed envelope marked "Source Selection Sensitive"

COMPLETING THE FORM

Blocks 1 through 11 will be completed by the COTR or Technical Monitor, as applicable. Contact the ACO/CO if you require assistance or data in order to complete any of these blocks, especially blocks 1 through 6.

The Acquisition Division will be responsible for forwarding the completed form to the contractor for review and execution of blocks 12 and 13. The Acquisition Division will ensure blocks 14 through 16 are completed prior to filing in a secured location.

To Be Completed by COTR/Technical Monitor

Top of Form:	Indicate whether the report is a final or interim (annual) report, and give dates for the period of time being covered. Prior to the ending date of the contract, all reports should be marked "Interim".
Block 1:	Identify the name and address of the prime contractor.
Block 2:	Identify contract number of the contract being evaluated. If evaluation is being conducted for a specific task, include the task number.
Block 3:	Contract value or task value, as applicable. Include all options whether or not exercised to date.
Block 4:	Identify date that contract was awarded or task issued.
Block 5:	Identify completion date for contract or task as applicable.
Block 6:	All items that apply to the contractor task should be checked.
Block 7:	Provide a clear and concise description of the work being done under the contract or task and the current level of funding. Attach additional sheet(s), if needed, to ensure the description is adequate for future source selection officials to determine relevance.

VNTSC F 4200.7

(5/96)

OPI:85

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION – SEE FAR 3.104

9. Key Personnel: (Fill in as appropriate) <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; margin-top: 10px;"> <div style="width: 45%;">Name/Title: _____</div> <div style="width: 45%;">Period of Performance: _____</div> </div> <div style="margin-top: 10px;">Comments: _____</div>				
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; margin-top: 10px;"> <div style="width: 45%;">Name/Title: _____</div> <div style="width: 45%;">Period of Performance: _____</div> </div> <div style="margin-top: 10px;">Comments: _____</div>				
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; margin-top: 10px;"> <div style="width: 45%;">Name/Title: _____</div> <div style="width: 45%;">Period of Performance: _____</div> </div> <div style="margin-top: 10px;">Comments: _____</div>				
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; margin-top: 10px;"> <div style="width: 45%;">Name/Title: _____</div> <div style="width: 45%;">Period of Performance: _____</div> </div> <div style="margin-top: 10px;">Comments: _____</div>				
10. Would you recommend this firm for award? Please explain. <div style="height: 50px; border: 1px solid black; margin-top: 5px;"></div>				
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; margin-top: 10px;"> <div style="width: 50%;">11. COTR/Program Manager/Tech Monitor Name (Printed): _____</div> <div style="width: 45%;">Signature _____</div> </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; margin-top: 10px;"> <div style="width: 50%;">Phone/FAX/Internet Address: _____</div> <div style="width: 45%;">Date: _____</div> </div>				
12. Contractor's Review: Were comments, rebuttals, or additional information provided: <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Please attach comments: Number of pages: _____				
13. Reviewer's Name (Printed): _____			Signature: _____	
Phone/FAX/Internet Address: _____			Date: _____	
14. Agency Review: Were contractor comments reviewed at a level above the Contracting Officer? <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Please attach comments. Number of pages: _____				
15. Final Ratings. Re-assess the Block 8 ratings based on contractor comments and agency review. Revise block 8 ratings, if appropriate.				
Quality _____	Cost Control _____	Timeliness _____	Business Relations _____	Customer Satisfaction _____
16. Contracting Officer's Name (Printed): _____			Signature _____	
Phone/FAX/Internet Address: _____			Date: _____	

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION – SEE FAR 3.104

Block 8 RATING DEFINITIONS

0 – Unsatisfactory - Performance failed to satisfy the minimum contract or task requirements, technical or otherwise. Areas of deficiency could include, but are not limited to: failure to meet schedules; failure to adequately estimate or control costs; inadequate staffing; lack of cooperation and responsiveness.

1 – Minimally Acceptable – Performance generally met minimum contract or task requirements, but significant issues arose which required expenditure of time or resources by the Government to ensure the requirements were met. Areas of re-work could include: late or incomplete deliverables; poor quality of work; lack of communication; cost control problems; contract administration problems.

2 – Satisfactory – Met all technical and administrative contract or task requirements. Minor issues arose which were resolved with minimal expenditure of time or resources.

3 – Good – Met all contract or task requirements and exceeded minimal requirements in some areas. No problems with quality, timeliness, or cost issues. Management was responsive.

4 – Exceptional – Performance significantly exceeded minimal technical requirements and met all other contract requirements. Areas in which performance was exceptional could include: early deliveries; creative approach; innovative technology; effective and proactive management and administration; commitment to customer satisfaction.

Block 8 – COMMENT ELEMENTS BY CATEGORY

(a) Quality of product/service

- (1) Compliance with contract or task requirements;
- (2) Accuracy of reports;
- (3) Appropriateness of contractor personnel assigned to the contract or task; and
- (4) Technical excellence of delivered supplies or services.

(b) Cost Control

- (1) Current, accurate, and complete billings;
- (2) The relationship of negotiated cost to actuals;
- (3) Cost containment initiatives; and
- (4) The number and cause of change orders issued.

(c) Timeliness of Performance

- (1) Whether the contractor met interim milestones;
- (2) Contractor's responsiveness to technical direction;
- (3) Contractor's responsiveness to contract change orders and administrative requirements;
- (4) Whether the contract/task was completed on time, including wrap-up and contract administration.

(d) Business Relations

- (1) Whether the contractor effectively managed the contract/task effort;
- (2) How responsive the contractor was to contract requirements;
- (3) How promptly the contractor notified the Government of problems;
- (4) Whether the contractor was reasonable and cooperative;
- (5) How flexible the contractor was;
- (6) Whether the contractor was proactive;
- (7) The effectiveness of contractor-recommended solutions; and
- (8) Whether the contractor effectively implemented socioeconomic programs.

Block 8: Circle the rating in the far right column that best describes the contractor's overall performance for each category. Comments and/or examples in sufficient detail to support the ratings must be provided. Attach additional comment sheets if needed. Definitions for each rating and a description of elements to consider when commenting on each category can be found at the end of these instructions.

Block 9: Identify the individual(s) primarily responsible for performance of the contract/task, not necessarily the persons identified as "Key Personnel" in the contractual document. Indicate how long each individual worked on the contract/task. If there were many individuals involved or many changes in these managers, a second page may be necessary. On the comments line, describe the key person's performance, attaching additional sheets when necessary.

Block 10: Explain why, given a choice, you would or would not recommend the contractor for an award to perform a similar contract or task.

Block 11: The COTR or Technical Monitor delegated responsibility for the day to day administration of the contract or task should sign this block, after consulting with the CO/ACO, where appropriate.

To be Completed by Contractor

Block 12: Block 12 must be completed to indicate that the contractor has been given the opportunity to review the evaluation.

The contractor will be provided with a copy of the completed evaluation form (including initial ratings) and attachments. The contractor has the right to submit to the CO comments, rebutting statements, or additional information which specifically addresses elements of the review. This response must be structured to clearly identify the specific category being addressed. This response must be delivered to the CO no later than 30 days after the mailing date on the evaluation form. In the event no response is received, the contractor will be deemed to have accepted the evaluation form as written.

Block 13: The contractor should sign this block to indicate that it has had an opportunity to review and comment on the ratings.

To be completed by the CO/ACO

Block 14: If the contractor accepts the ratings, they will be entered as Final Ratings in Block 15, no Agency Review is required, and the Contracting Officer's signature in Block 16 completes the process.

If the contractor objects to the initial ratings, a review will be undertaken by the CO, in consultation with the technical staff. If the CO does not concur in a modification, the matter will be reviewed at a level above the CO within the Acquisition Division, and a Final Rating determined by the Reviewing Official's Report, which will be attached to the Performance Report.

Block 15: If the initial ratings have been modified by either the CO or after Agency Review, insert the revised Final Ratings. If there has been no change to the initial ratings, insert the initial ratings.

Block 16: If agreement is reached on the ratings without an Agency Review, the CO will sign. If an Agency Review is carried out, the block must be signed by the Reviewing Official.

Exhibit C

Client Authorization Letter

[*Company Name*]
[*Street Address*]
[*City, State/Province/Zip/Postal Code*]
[*Date*]

[*Recipient Name*]
[*Address*]
[*City, State/Province Zip/Postal Code*]

Dear [Client]:

We are currently responding to the Volpe Center RFP No. _____ for the procurement of _____. The Volpe Center is placing increased emphasis in their acquisitions on past performance as a source selection evaluation factor. The Volpe Center requires Offerors to inform references identified in proposals that the Volpe Center may contact them about contract performance information.

If you are contacted by the Volpe Center for information on work we have performed under contract for your company/agency/state or local Government, you are hereby authorized to respond to Volpe Center inquiries.

Your cooperation is appreciated. Please direct any questions to _____.
(Offeror's point of contact)

Sincerely,
[*Your name*]
[*Your position*]

[*Typist's initials*]
Enclosure: [*Number*]

cc: [Name]

L.8 INSTRUCTIONS FOR SUBMISSION OF VOLUME II - COST/BUSINESS PROPOSAL

A. INTRODUCTION

1. The cost proposal will permit the Government to determine whether the proposed costs demonstrate cost realism.

“Cost realism” means the costs in an Offeror’s proposal are:

- (a) realistic for the work to be performed;
- (b) reflect a clear understanding of the requirements; and
- (c) are consistent with the various elements of the Offeror’s technical proposal.

All information relating to cost or pricing must be included in this volume of the proposal; under no circumstances shall cost or pricing data be included elsewhere.

The cost proposal should be prepared in sufficient detail to permit thorough and complete evaluation by the Government without additional correspondence or communication. During its evaluation, the Government may request clarifications, answers to questions that assist in the Government’s understanding of information contained in your cost proposal, or the correction of minor omissions or errors that do not alter the offer. However, the Government anticipates making award on initial offers and does not expect to hold discussions. Consequently, you are advised that failure to provide the required schedules and supporting calculations, narrative explanation, and documentation may result in the rejection of your offer if in the Government’s best interest, rather than opening of discussions.

If the Contracting Officer determines that an Offeror’s initially proposed costs do not reflect what it would reasonably cost that Offeror to perform the requirements, then the Contracting Officer may make adjustments to the proposed costs to determine probable cost.

To facilitate cost/business proposal preparation, a checklist is provided for use by the prime Offeror and each subcontractor. The checklist should be completed and submitted as part of your proposal.

2. **For evaluation purposes, Offerors are required to propose estimated costs using the labor hours and provided in Clause B.5 Level of Effort – IDIQ, and reiterated in Schedule 3 below.** Hours should be apportioned between the prime and its subcontractors in a manner consistent with the Offeror’s technical proposal.
3. If any of the cost proposal instructions appear incompatible with established/approved accounting practices, Offerors shall notify the Contracting Officer within 14 calendar days of the issuance date of the RFP.

B. FORMAT

In addition to the requirements set forth in FAR 52.215-20 Requirements For Cost Or Pricing Data Or Information Other Than Cost Or Pricing Data (Oct 1997) - Alternate IV (Oct 1997, the cost/business proposal shall be submitted in three sections as follows:

Section I - Solicitation Documents

Section II - Information Other Than Cost and Pricing Data

Section III – Subcontracting Plan (not applicable to Small Business offerors)

C. SECTION I - SOLICITATION DOCUMENTS

In this section, Offerors shall submit a completed and signed SF 33 (page 1 of the solicitation) including acknowledgment of any amendments; and Representation, Certifications, and Other Statements of Offerors (Section K of the solicitation).

D. SECTION II - INFORMATION OTHER THAN COST AND PRICING DATA

1. PART 1 - DETAILED INSTRUCTIONS

The Offeror shall submit a signed Proposal Cover Sheet (Schedule 1) and information other than cost and pricing data as set forth below. Summary data shall be placed on the Proposal Cover Sheet and Schedules 2 and 3 should support it. In addition, as discussed in Paragraph L.5.C., Consistency between Technical and Cost/Business proposals, a matrix or matrixes showing how the hours are apportioned in each labor category must be provided in any format that can be easily read and understood by Government evaluators. The hours allocated to each person whose resume is provided in accordance with the technical instructions must be highlighted.

Accounting System Approval

The Volpe Center presently has no funds available with which to fund accounting system reviews. The Government will not award a contract or approve a cost-type subcontract to a firm whose accounting system has not been approved by the Defense Contract Audit Agency. Accounting systems reviews will be requested if funds become available, but award of a contract will not be delayed pending determination of an approved accounting system.

Labor

Regardless of the labor practices used, provide the proposed unloaded hourly labor rates for the labor categories (identified in Clause B.2-Level of Effort-IDIQ) on Schedule 3. Show all calculations used to compute the proposed direct labor rates, and provide the basis and rationale for the labor rates ; for example, company-wide bidding rates, current salary data for named individuals, survey data, or anticipated new-hires, etc. Show how company categories are mapped to the RFP categories.

For individuals whose resumes are provided in the technical proposal, provide the current labor rates from payroll records and, also, those labor rates escalated to each contract year. **For contingent hires, the offeror shall provide a separate offering letter showing the offered and agreed upon salary, signed by the contingent hire.**

Uncompensated Overtime

Uncompensated overtime is defined as hours in excess of forty per week for which no additional compensation is paid in excess of the normal weekly salary for Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) exempt employees. Use of uncompensated overtime is not encouraged.

This procurement represents a dedicated staff performing at a Government facility. To maintain a level playing field for all offerors, and to eliminate gimmickry through the use of uncompensated overtime, all cost proposals must be priced excluding uncompensated overtime.

If an offeror's practice is to propose uncompensated overtime, it may provide information about its practice and an estimated cost impact.

Indirect Rates

The Government anticipates that offerors will use a field overhead rate because the work is being performed at a Government facility.

Offerors are required to provide a schedule of their indirect rates and explain the allocation bases. Include all rates which the Offeror maintains in its accounting records which may be used during performance of this contract. Identify indirect rates which a Government audit agency has approved for forward pricing. Show the rates, allocation bases, and evidence of Government review and approval.

If not approved, state the basis of the proposed rate (e.g., previous year's actuals, current fiscal year-to-date, business plan, etc.). Provide historical rate information, rationale, and other factors used to develop and support the proposed indirect rates used to cost the proposal. Also, provide actual expense pool amounts, allocation bases, and rates which have been submitted to the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) (or other cognizant Government audit agency) in your overhead rate proposal for establishing final indirect rates.

If an offeror has not previously maintained a field overhead rate but proposes one for this effort, it should ensure that sufficient information is provided so that the rate may be evaluated without discussion.

Other Direct Costs (ODC)

RFP Stipulated (Travel \$50,000 and equipment \$45,000 per year of contract performance, without escalation.

Offeror Estimated: Offerors should identify by nomenclature and estimate amounts for any additional ODC's which are anticipated to support the proposed effort. This includes any administrative and support labor estimated to be chargeable to this effort in accordance with the offeror's usual accounting practices (e.g. contract or subcontract administration, secretarial, purchasing agents, receivers, etc.). Indicate what types of administrative and support labor the offeror considers direct labor, and estimate hours for each type of labor. Provide an explanation for the estimated hours and show calculations. ODC's not identified and priced in your proposal, including any such administrative and support labor, will not be billable during performance without prior Contracting Officer approval.

Subcontracts

Subcontractors must submit a cost proposal in accordance with the cost proposal instructions in this section. Subcontracts estimated to exceed \$500,000 should be supported by a Proposal Cover Sheet. All subcontractors must follow the same cost proposal instructions as the prime, except where noted. Regardless of dollar value, subcontract proposals must be adequately documented to facilitate an evaluation of proposed costs.

Offerors that enter into subcontracts other than on a cost-reimbursement type basis may make appropriate adjustments to the instructions and schedules. Information as to the type of subcontract contemplated and documentation to show why the contract type is anticipated must be included. The guidance in FAR Part 16 should be followed. For example, those Offerors contemplating time-and-material or labor-hour subcontracts shall follow the procedures specified in FAR Subpart 16.6. The following information should also be provided for time-and-material or labor-hour agreements (such as those with consultants): (1) Details of what cost elements are included in the rate and what costs, if any, will be charged in addition to the rate; (2) The result of the Offeror's analysis of

invoices submitted to other clients by the subcontractor or consultant which support the proposed rate or rates; (3) A signed statement from the consultant or the subcontractor that the proposed rate is a "Most Favored Customer Rate," or the reason it was not offered; and (4) A rate comparison from the Offeror which indicates that the rate proposed is comparable to the rates other consultants or subcontractors receive for performing similar types of work.

The Offeror shall provide the names of the other consultants or subcontractors used in the comparison.

It is the responsibility of the prime Contractor to review and evaluate the subcontract proposal and accompanying cost or pricing data and furnish the results of such review to the Government as part of their cost submission, regardless of whether the details are provided to the prime Offeror or separately to the Government. The prime's review should be as detailed as the information provided by the subcontractor directly to the prime permits. A subcontractor whose evaluation is considered insufficient by the Government, either because the data submitted to the Government is incomplete or because the prime fails to conduct and document a comprehensive evaluation, will be deleted from technical consideration and the prime's technical proposal will be evaluated without it.

Escalation

State clearly the escalation rate used and provide rationale. Include actual, historical escalation for the past three (3) years and explain clearly your method of calculating it.

Cost of Money

Attach supporting calculations.

Profit Objectives

We consider fee and profit a function of competition, but we may utilize the weighted guidelines method in TAM 1215.9 and Appendix E to evaluate them. Your cost proposal should contain adequate data and rationale for any consideration you want included for Contract Risk and Special Factors.

2. PART 2 - EXPLANATION OF COST/BUSINESS PROPOSAL SCHEDULES

Schedule 1: "Proposal Cover Sheet". Prime Offerors and subcontractors should complete.

Schedule 2: "Summary of Proposed Costs and Fee/Profit." The schedule should be completed consistent and may be revised accordingly. The figures on this schedule must agree with the Proposal Cover Sheet.

Schedule 3: "Summary of Proposed Labor Cost." The amounts on those schedules should correspond to the amounts for labor in Schedule 2. The hours used to develop the prime Offeror's labor cost must correspond with the allocation of hours shown in the table of Clause B.2-Level of Effort-IDIQ in this solicitation.

SCHEDULE 1

PROPOSAL COVER SHEET				1. SOLICITATION/CONTRACT/MODIFICATION NUMBER			
2a. NAME OF OFFEROR				3a. NAME OF OFFEROR'S POINT OF CONTACT			
2b. FIRST LINE ADDRESS				3b. TITLE OF OFFEROR'S POINT OF CONTACT			
2c. STREET ADDRESS				3c. TELEPHONE		3c. FACSIMILE	
2d. CITY	2e.	2f. ZIP CODE		AREA	NUMBER	AREA	NUMBER
4. TYPE OF CONTRACT OR SUBCONTRACT (<i>Check</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> FFP <input type="checkbox"/> CPFF <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> CPAF <input type="checkbox"/> FPI <input type="checkbox"/> CPIF				5. <input type="checkbox"/> PRIME OFFEROR <input type="checkbox"/> SUBCONTRACTOR			
6. ESTIMATED COST, FEE AND PROFIT INFORMATION							
A. ESTIMATED COST							
B. FIXED FEE							
C. TOTAL COST PLUS FIXED FEE							
7. PROVIDE THE FOLLOWING							
NAME OF COGNIZANT CONTRACT ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCY				NAME OF COGNIZANT GOVERNMENT AUDIT AGENCY			
STREET ADDRESS				STREET ADDRESS			
CITY		STATE	ZIP CODE	CITY		STATE	ZIP CODE
TELEPHONE	AREA CODE	NUMBER		TELEPHONE	AREA CODE	NUMBER	
FACSIMILE	AREA CODE	NUMBER		FACSIMILE	AREA CODE	NUMBER	
NAME OF CONTACT				NAME OF CONTACT			
PROPERTY SYSTEM <input type="checkbox"/> Reviewed by cognizant contract administrative <input type="checkbox"/> Reviewed by cognizant contract administrative <input type="checkbox"/> Never reviewed				APPROXIMATE DATE OF LAST			
PURCHASING SYSTEM <input type="checkbox"/> Reviewed by cognizant contract administrative agency and determined acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Reviewed by cognizant contract administrative <input type="checkbox"/> Never reviewed				PURPOSE OF AUDIT (e.g. proposal review, establishment of billing rates, finalize indirect rates, etc.)			
ACCOUNTING SYSTEM <input type="checkbox"/> Audited and determined acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Audited and determined not acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Never audited				OFFEROR'S FISCAL YEAR			
8a. NAME OF OFFEROR (<i>Typed</i>)				9. NAME OF FIRM			
8b. TITLE OF OFFEROR (<i>Typed</i>)							
10. SIGNATURE					11. DATE OF SUBMISSION		

OFFEROR NAME: _____

SCHEDULE 2

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED COSTS AND FEE

<u>Cost Category</u>		<u>Year 1</u>	<u>Year 2</u>	<u>Year 3</u>	<u>Year 4</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
	<u>Rates</u>					
Direct Labor						
Fringe Benefits	_____					
Overhead	_____					
Subcontracts ¹						
Other Direct Costs (ODC)		85,000.	85,000.	85,000.	85,000.	340,000
Offeror Estimated ODC						
ODC Burden	_____					
Subtotal						
G&A	_____					
Cost of Money						
Total Cost						
Fixed Fee						
TOTAL Cost Plus Fixed Fee						

¹ Not applicable to subcontractors

PRIME NAME: _____
OR
SUB NAME: _____

SCHEDULE 3

SUMMARY OF DIRECT LABOR COSTS

<u>A</u> LABOR CATEGORIES	<u>B</u> TOTAL LABOR HOURS	<u>C</u> DIRECT LABOR RATE (UNESCALAT ED)	<u>D</u> AVERAGE ESCALATION RATE BY CONTRACT YEAR				<u>E</u> DIRECT LABOR RATES ESCALATED TO CONTRACT MID-POINT	<u>F</u> TOTAL AVERAGE DIRECT LABOR COST
			YR 1	YR 2	YR 3	YR 4	(EST. NOV 2001)	(COLUMN B x COLUMN E)
Program Manager	2,000							
Senior Engineer	17,000							
Engineer	6,500							
Junior Engineer/Technician	3,000							
Total	29,500							TOTAL:

SECTION III - SUBCONTRACTING PLAN

In accordance with FAR 52.219-9, offerors who are not small business concerns shall submit a Small, Small Disadvantaged and Women-Owned Small Business Subcontracting Plan. The plan must be submitted in accordance with FAR Part 19 and must comply with FAR 19.704. The offeror shall show the subcontractor's business size, and the percentage and type of workload estimated to be subcontracted out. All cost and technical information must be included in the appropriate sections of the offeror's proposal in addition to the submission of the subcontracting plan. The socio-economic Volpe Center goals with the Small Business Administration are currently as follows:

<u>Subcontract Awards</u>	<u>Percent of Dollars Awarded</u>
Awards to Small Businesses	20%
Awards to Small Disadvantaged Businesses	10%
Awards to Women-Owned Businesses	5%

These goals are not intended to be mandatory but offerors are encouraged to keep these goals in mind when developing their subcontracting plan. Please note that these goals must be proposed as a percentage of total dollars being subcontracted. A business may count toward more than one of the goals shown above. For example, a small disadvantaged business owned by a woman, may count toward each of the three goals.

L.9 SOLICITATION MAILING INSTRUCTIONS

To facilitate proper handling of your bid, offer or amendment thereof, it is imperative that the outermost envelope/packaging which contains the bid/offer/amendment bear the attached label (if a label is provided herewith) or be addressed in the format presented in the "Issued by" Block on page 1 of this solicitation.

SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.1 GENERAL EVALUATION INFORMATION

A. Basis for Award. It is the Government's intent to make award based upon initial offers without entering into discussions or negotiations. Award will be made to the responsive and responsible Offeror whose offer provide the greatest overall value to the Government, based on the technical proposal and the cost/business proposal. While it is the Government's intent to make award based upon initial offers, the Government may, nevertheless, determine during the evaluation period that it is necessary to conduct discussions. In that case, the Contracting Officer will proceed to establish a competitive range and conduct negotiations with the firms in that range.

B. Order of Importance. The evaluation factors other than cost, i.e., the technical proposal, when combined, are significantly more important than cost in the selection of Contractors for award. Notwithstanding this fact, Offerors are cautioned not to minimize the importance of the cost proposal. The cost evaluation will become more significant when the Past Performance, Capability of the Organization and Response to Hypothetical Tasks of the Offerors are closer; when these factors other than cost are essentially equal, cost may become the determining factor in making awards. The Government expects to award one contract under this solicitation.

M.2 TECHNICAL PROPOSAL EVALUATION

General. The technical proposal will consist of a written submission covering Past Performance, Capability of the Organization, and Response to Hypothetical Tasks in which the Offeror will demonstrate technical understanding and approach to management.

Criteria for Evaluation. Your proposal will be evaluated in accordance with the criteria described below. It is important that you direct your proposal to the criteria and cover each appropriately as you respond to the proposal requirements. The Technical Proposal will be the most important factor in the evaluation of your proposal and in the selection of the Contractor. Notwithstanding the fact that the Technical Proposal is of significant importance in the overall evaluation, offerors are cautioned not to minimize the importance of the Business Proposal since award will be made to that offeror whose proposal is most advantageous to the Government after evaluation of both the Technical and Business Proposals.

1. The technical criteria include the following three major elements: Capability of the Organization (Parts A, B, C and D), Response to Hypothetical Tasks, and Past Performance. Specifically:

I. Capability of the Organization:

- (A) Staff Support/Qualifications: evaluation of the proposed staff's capability to support the spectrum of anticipated Task Items in view of experience, qualifications, and depth and soundness of technical background of each of the three staff categories: Project Manager, Core Technical Staff, and Adjunct Technical Staff.
- (B) Facilities: evaluation of contractor team's facilities, equipment, laboratory and field test support, computer systems, etc. supporting all the task item's requirements

(C) Management Program – evaluation of contractor team’s ability to quickly assign qualified staff and facilities to a TO, soundness of the technical and fiscal management of the TO, and adequacy of management controls for timely and within budget performance of each task item.

(D) Task Item Capabilities: evaluation of the contractor team’s capability to support each of the six Task Items

II. Hypothetical Task - The hypothetical tasks will be evaluated for the completeness, soundness, practicality, and relevancy of the response to each item of the hypothetical task, main emphases being on problem formulation, technical approach, and managerial approach for obtaining a technically adequate result within a reasonable period of performance and funding level.

III. Past Performance - The Government will evaluate information on past performance provided by the Offeror and obtained from other entities. Any past performance score of less than satisfactory may be cause for rejection of the proposal. If subsequent discussions are conducted, the Offeror will be allowed to address unfavorable information that he has not previously had the opportunity to review. If the Offeror does not have a past performance history, the Offeror will not be evaluated on this factor.

The above criteria are weighted along the following *approximate* levels of importance:

I and II are weighted equal and both are weight higher than III.

M.3 COST/BUSINESS EVALUATION CRITERIA (JUN 2001)

COST/BUSINESS EVALUATION CRITERIA

1. Proposed costs will be evaluated for fairness, reasonableness and realism. Cost realism, as defined and discussed in FAR 15.401 and 15.401-1(d), will be conducted on all line items. The Government will calculate probable cost for CLIN 0001. The probable cost developed as a result of the cost realism analysis may differ from proposed cost. The probable cost shall be used for purposes of evaluation to determine the best value and will be used in the selection decision.
2. These cost/business evaluation criteria are not necessarily in order of importance, nor will the criteria be numerically scored.
 - a. Fairness, reasonableness, and cost realism of proposed cost;
 - b. Consistency between cost and technical proposals;
 - c. Compensation of professional employees will be evaluated in accordance with Section L, FAR 52.222-46;
 - d. Uncompensated overtime, if any, will be evaluated in accordance with Section L, FAR 52.237-10; and
 - e. Acceptability of the Small, Small Disadvantage and Women-Owned Small Business Subcontracting Plan, if applicable (Section I, FAR 52.219-9).